

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 01418 01 OF 03 180746Z

12

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 SS-20

USIA-15 SAM-01 NEA-11 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04

AEC-11 AECE-00 OMB-01 DRC-01 /166 W
----- 080547

P R 151856Z FEB 74

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1646

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 3 VIENNA 1418

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: AD HOC GROUP MEETING,
FEBRUARY 14, 1974

1. BEGIN SUMMARY. THE AHG MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, CHAIRED BY GREEK REP (DOUNTAS), ADDRESSED THE FOLLOWING SUBJECTS: NORWEGIAN REP'S INABILITY TO REPRESENT THE AHG IN BRUSSELS, A CHANGE IN THE CRITERIA FOR REPORTING INFORMAL MEETINGS WITH EAST, THE FEBRUARY 14 INFORMAL MEETING BETWEEN ALLIED AND EASTERN REPS, THE SELECTION OF ALLIED REPS FOR THE NEXT INFORMAL MEETINGS, THE NETHERLANDS REP'S REPORT TO THE NAC, AND THE PROPOSED PLENARY PRESENTATION ON FLANK SECURITY AND STABILIZING MEASURES.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 01418 01 OF 03 180746Z

TION ON FLANK SECURITY AND STABILIZING MEASURES.

END SUMMARY.

2. NORWEGIAN DEL OFF (BRUNTESEN) SAID THAT NORWAY COULD NOT REPRESENT THE AHG IN BRUSSELS BECAUSE THE NORWEGIAN REP (VARNO) HAD HAD TO LEAVE VIENNA FOR PERSONAL REASONS, AND THIS LEFT NORWAY WITH ONLY ONE REP IN VIENNA. NORWEGIANS HAD ASKED THE TURKS TO STAND IN, BUT THEY COULD NOT ARRANGE THE TRIP ON SUCH SHORT NOTICE. HE HAD TALKED OF THIS WITH NETHERLANDS REP AND FELT THAT THE OTHER TWO AHG REPS ON THE TRIP COULD ADEQUATELY REPRESENT FLANK INTERESTS. CHAIRMAN SAID THAT HE REGRETTED NORWEGIAN REP'S INABILITY TO ATTEND; HE ASKED IF ANY OTHER FLANK COUNTRIES WOULD LIKE TO GO IN PLACE OF THE NORWEGIANS. CHAIRMAN CONCLUDED THAT IT WOULD BE AGREEABLE TO THE GROUP FOR FLANK INTERESTS TO BE REPRESENTED IN BRUSSELS BY THE OTHER TWO REPS.

3. NETHERLANDS REP SUGGESTED A REVISION TO THE CRITERIA FOR PARTICIPATION IN INFORMAL TALKS WHICH HE HAD SUGGESTED ON FEBRUARY 13; A SECTION OF PARAGRAPH FOUR SHOULD BE CHANGED TO READ "...INDIRECT PARTICIPANTS SHOULD HAVE A RIGHT TO REPRESENT THE AHG..." THIS WOULD MEAN THAT ALL COUNTRIES WOULD HAVE A RIGHT TO ATTEND THE MEETINGS BUT THAT CERTAIN MEMBERS WOULD HAVE A MORE DIRECT AND SUBSTANTIAL INTEREST THAN OTHERS. CHAIRMAN SAID THAT HE COULD SUPPORT THAT CHANGE, AND ITALIAN REP ASKED FOR THE COMPLETE PAPER TO BE DISTRIBUTED.

4. CHAIRMAN TURNED DISCUSSION TO THE INFORMAL MEETING BETWEEN THE ALLIED AND EASTERN REPS ON FEBRUARY 13. US DELEGATION DISTRIBUTED COPIES OF ITS REPORT OF THE MEETING AND OF THE TALKING POINTS THAT WERE USED IN THE MEETING (SEPTELS). CHAIRMAN ASKED US REP TO COMMENT ON THE SESSION. US REP SAID THAT THE REPORT'S SUMMARY GAVE A GOOD OVERALL IMPRESSION OF THE RESULTS OF THE DISCUSSION. THE ALLIED REPS BEGAN WITH THE POINTS IN THE TALKING PAPER AND RECAPITULATED ARGUMENT THAT THE MAJOR COMMON ELEMENT BETWEEN

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 01418 01 OF 03 180746Z

EASTERN AND WESTERN PROPOSALS WAS US AND SOVIET GROUND FORCES. SOVIET REP (KHLESTOV) SAID THAT DISCUSSION SHOULD COVER THE PROGRAMS OF BOTH SIDES, THE WESTERN RESPONSE WAS THAT SUCH ACTION WOULD MAKE THE INFORMAL MEETINGS RESEMBLE PLENARY MEETINGS WHERE BOTH SIDES TOOK FIXED POSITIONS. INSTEAD, THE PARTICIPANTS SHOULD DISCUSS COMMON ELEMENTS IN THE TWO PROPOSALS. KHLESTOV SEEMED TO SUGGEST THAT

NATIONAL FORCES AND OTHER FOREIGN FORCES MIGHT BE COMMON ELEMENTS. US REP TRIED TO EXPAND THE EXAMPLES OF COMMON ELEMENTS, BUT KHESTOV HAD BACKED AWAY AND SAID THE GROUP SHOULD LOOK OVER THE ENTIRE RANGE OF SUBJECT MATTER TO SELECT COMMON ELEMENTS. EASTERN REPS HAD STRESSED NATIONAL AND FOREIGN FORCES WITH ALL OF THEIR COMPONENTS, A PROBABLY REFERENCE TO NUCLEAR AND AIR FORCES. US REP SPECULATED THAT KHESTOV'S REMARK THAT HE MIGHT BE INTERESTED IN DISCUSSING TIMING MEANT THAT HE MIGHT BE INTERESTED IN DISCUSSING THE ORDER IN WHICH TOPICS WOULD BE DISCUSSED AND THE TIME THAT WOULD BE SPENT ON EACH. THIS WAS NOT EXPLORED FURTHER, BECAUSE IT CAME UP AT THE END OF THE MEETING.

5. CHAIRMAN ASKED WHICH COMMON ELEMENTS HAD BEEN DISCUSSED. US REP SAID THAT KHESTOV HAD SUGGESTED THAT OTHER FOREIGN FORCES MIGHT BE COMMON ELEMENTS, AND THE ALLIED RESPONSE WAS THAT US/SOVIET GROUND FORCES WERE THE MAJOR COMMON ELEMENT. US DEP REP SAID THAT THE EASTERN SIDE STRESSED THE FORMULA THAT FORCES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WITH ALL THEIR "COMPONENTS". THE NETHERLANDS REP ASKED WHAT WERE THE ASPECTS OF THE MBFR NEGOTIATIONS THAT WESTERN REPS HAD TERMED MORE DIFFICULT AND TOUCHY THAN US/SOVIET GROUND FORCE REDUCTIONS, AND CANADIAN REP (GRANDE) RESPONDED THAT THIS REFERRED TO CANADIAN AND UK FORCES.

6. CHAIRMAN ASKED IF EITHER UK OR BELGIAN REPS WISHED TO COMMENT ON THE MEETING. BELGIAN REP SAID THAT THERE WAS GREATER DIFFICULTY THAN THERE HAD BEEN AT THE PREVIOUS MEETING, BUT THAT IT WAS NORMAL

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 01418 01 OF 03 180746Z

BECAUSE THE ALLIED REPS WERE TRYING TO PRESS THEIR POINTS. IT IS NECESSARY TO ESCAPE FROM THIS IMPASSE. A POSITIVE POINT WAS THAT WHEN BELGIAN REP HAD TRIED TO INTRODUCE PHASING INTO THE DISCUSSION HE HAD NOT BEEN REFUSED. ANOTHER POSITIVE POINT WAS THAT THE EASTERN REPS DID NOT ARGUE FOR THEIR PROPOSAL AS SUCH THEY ONLY INSISTED THAT THE WEST SHOULD CONSIDER EASTERN INTERESTS ON AN EQUAL BASIS. BELGIAN REP CONSIDERED THESE PRACTICES SIGNED A DE FACTO ACCEPTANCE OF THE WESTERN BASIS OF DISCUSSION; THE EAST IS TRYING TO INJECT THEIR CONCERNS INTO THE WESTERN CONCEPTS.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET POSS DUPE

PAGE 01 VIENNA 01418 02 OF 03 160635Z

13

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 SS-20

USIA-15 SAM-01 NEA-11 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04

AEC-11 OMB-01 DRC-01 AECE-00 /166 W

----- 063731

P R 151856Z FEB 74

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1647

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 3 VIENNA 1418

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

7. UK REP SAID THAT HE AGREED WITH WHAT HAD BEEN SAID, AND THAT HE HAD TWO FURTHER POINTS TO MAKE. FIRST, IT WAS CLEAR THAT KHLESTOV MISUNDERSTOOD NATO'S PROCEDURAL PROPOSAL AS BEING A SUBSTANTIVE PROPOSAL, AND THE ALLIED REPS HAD TO EXPLAIN THAT IT WAS NOT SEVERAL TIMES. SECOND, UK REP HAD NOTICED A NUMBER OF POSITIVE ELEMENTS AT THE MEETING. THE ATMOSPHERE WAS CORDIAL AND FRANK, AND THE DISCUSSION WAS FREE. NO UNACCEPTABLE DEMANDS WERE MADE, AND THE EAST WAS INTERESTED IN PURSUING DISCUSSIONS AT A FURTHER MEETING. BUT HE FELT THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD BE ON THEIR GUARD THAT THEY DID NOT SUBTLY SHIFT BASIS OF DISCUSSION TO EASTERN GROUNDS. THIS HAD NOT YET HAPPENED, BUT ALLIED REPS SHOULD BE VERY CAREFUL.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 01418 02 OF 03 160635Z

8. FRG REP (BEHREND) REPORTED ON THE DISCUSSION HE HAD HAD WITH SOVIET DEP REP (SMIRNOVSKY) BEFORE THE MORNING'S (FEBRUARY 14) PLENARY MEETING. SMIRNOVSKY HAD REPORTED THAT SOME PROGRESS WAS MADE AT THE INFORMAL MEETING GAA A SMALL STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION. SMIRNOVSKY SAID THAT HE HOPED REAL PROGRESS WOULD BE MADE BEFORE EASTER. FRG REP THEN COMMENTED THAT KHLESTOV'S MENTION OF US AND SOVIET STATIONED FORCES AND OF NATIONAL FORCES MIGHT BE A CLEVER COUNTER ARGUMENT, NOT A REAL SUGGESTION. ON FEBRUARY 8, KHLESTOV HAD TOLD FRG REP THAT IF US AND SOVIET FORCES WERE CONSIDERED COMMON ELEMENTS, FRG AND GDR FORCES SHOULD ALSO BE CONSIDERED COMMON ELEMENTS. FINALLY, FRG REP FOUND KHLESTOV'S INTEREST IN BELGIAN FORCES IN THE FRG PUZZLING. FRG REP HAD RESPONDED TO A SIMILAR ARGUMENT THAT IT IS NOT IMPORTANT WHERE BELGIAN FORCES ARE, SINCE ALL ARE IN THE NGA; KHLESTOV DID NOT PURSUE THE POINT FURTHER.

9. CHAIRMAN SUGGESTED THAT THE GROUP SHOULD LEAVE FURTHER DISCUSSION OF THE MEETING FOR THE AHG MEETING ON FEBRUARY 19, BUT THAT IT SHOULD FIRST DECIDE THE DATE AND THE COMPOSITION OF THE GROUP THAT WOULD ATTEND THE NEXT MEETING. US REP SAID THAT THE AGREED DATE WAS FEBRUARY 20, BUT BELGIAN REP SAID THAT AGREEMENT WAS FOR THE 19TH OR THE 20TH; HE ASKED THAT THE RECORD BE CHANGED TO REFLECT THIS. HE FELT THAT THE PROPOSALS THE NETHERLANDS REP HAD MADE AT THE FEBRUARY 13 AHG MEETING SHOULD BE THE BASIS FOR THE DECISION OF WHO WOULD REPRESENT THE ALLIES. FRG REP SAID THAT SMIRNOVSKY HAD TOLD HIM THAT THE NEXT MEETING WOULD BE ON FEBRUARY 20.

10. UK REP ASKED WHAT WOULD BE THE COMPOSITION OF THE COMING WEEK'S INFORMAL MEETING WITH THE EAST. HE FELT THAT IT WAS TIME TO CHANGE REPS, AND HE RECOMMENDED THAT FRG AND NETHERLANDS REPS BE REPLACEMENTS FOR HIMSELF AND THE BELGIAN REP. FRG REP AGREED WITH THIS PROPOSAL, BUT SAID THAT ON FEBRUARY 19 AND 20 THE GERMAN FOREIGN MINISTER WOULD BE PRESENT IN VIENNA AND THEREFORE FRG REP WOULD NOT BE AVAILABLE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 01418 02 OF 03 160635Z

TO ATTEND THE MEETINGS. BELGIAN REP SAID THAT THE PROBLEM COULD BE SOLVED BY THE NETHERLANDS REP'S POINTS FROM THE FEBRUARY 13 MEETING. THESE POINTS

CALLED FOR THE CHAIRMAN TO PROPOSE WHO WOULD ATTEND

AFTER KNOWING WHEN THE METING WOULD TAKE PLACE AND WHAT WOULD BE DISCUSSED. ALTHOUGH THE EAST AND WEST HAD NOT YET REACHED A LIMITED PROPOSAL AGREEMENT, BELGIAN REP SAID HE WOULD BE HAPPY TO CHANGE. IT SHOULD BE THE CHAIRMAN'S RESPONSIBILITY TO SUGGEST WHO THE ALLIED REPS WOULD BE. CHAIRMAN SAID THAT UK REP HAD FIRST BROUGHT UP THE SUBJECT. THE UK'S SUGGESTION APPEARED TO MEET THE APPROVAL OF THE AHG, BUT THE FRG REP UNFORTUNATELY COULD NOT GO. THEREFORE, IT MIGHT BE POSSIBLE FOR THE UK REP TO REPRESENT THE FRG REP AND GO TO THE MEETING WITH THE US AND NETHERLANDS REPS. FRG REP SAID THAT HE WAS AGAINST HAVING SUCH RIGID RULES THAT WOULD REQUIRE HIM TO BE REPRESENTED, BUT SAID THAT HE HAD NO OBJECTION TO UK AND NETHERLANDS REPS ATTENDING TOGETHER. ITALIAN REP (CAGIATI) SAID THAT ONLY ONE CHANGE AT A TIME MIGHT BE BETTER FOR STABILITY, AND THEREFORE UK REP COULD STAY AND CHANGE WITH FRG REP AT THE FOLLOWING MEETING. CANADIAN REP (GRANDE) SAID THAT WAS ALL RIGHT WITH HIM. BUT HE WAS READY TO VOLUNTEER TO ATTEND ALSO, SINCE HE HAD NOT YET ATTENDED A SUBSTANTIVE DINNER.

11. CHAIRMAN SAID THAT THERE WERE THREE MAIN ALTERNATIVES; ROSE AND QUARLES, GRANDE AND QUARLES, OR ROSE AND ADRIAENSSEN. BELGIAN REP SAID THAT HE HAD NO DESIRE TO PROPOSE HIMSELF AGAIN, BUT THAT HE FELT THE AHG SHOULD SEE WHAT WOULD BE DISCUSSED BEFORE DECIDING WHO WOULD GO. CHAIRMAN ASKED IF BELGIAN REP FELT THAT THE SUBJECT MATTER JUSTIFIED THE CHANGE IN PERSONNEL. FRG REP SAID THAT HE SUPPORTED DEFERRING DISCUSSION THESE PARTICIPATION OF POINTS UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING. BELGIAN REP REPEATED HIS VIEW THAT SUBJECTS SHOULD BE DECIDED BEFORE THE PARTICIPANTS WERE DETERMINED AND INDICATED THAT IF THE SUBJECT MATTER WAS NOT CHANGED HE MIGHT WISH TO STAY AS A REPRESENTATIVE.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 01418 02 OF 03 160635Z

12. NETHERLANDS REP ASKED IF, IN REPORTING THE INFORMAL MEETING WITH EAST TO THE NAC IT WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE FOR HIM TO SAY THAT THESE METINGS MIGHT BE AN INDICATION THAT THERE MIGHT BE SOME COMMON ELEMENTS IN THE APPROACHES. US REP SAID THAT HE WOULD PREFER TO SAY THAT THE EAST HAS SHOWN AN INTEREST IN DEFINING TOPICS AND THAT THE WEST WAS TRYING TO PUSH THEM FURTHER IN THIS DIRECTION. ALLIED REPS ARE TRYING TO USE COMMON ELEMENTS TO SELECT TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION, OR AT LEAST THE ORDER OF THE TOPICS. THE EST IS CONCERNED THAT THE COMMON ELEMENT CONCEPT IS A TRAP TO SELECT TOPICS FAVORABLE TO THE WEST. US DEP REP SAID MAIN THRUST OF NEXT ROUND MIGHT BE TO DISCOVER WHETHER KHLESTOV'S REFERENCES TO TIMING CONCEALED ANY FLEXIBILITY CONCERNING BEGINNING DISCUSSIONS WITH U.S. AND SOVIET GROUND FORCES.

13. THE AHG NEXT TURNED ITS ATTENTION TO A CONSIDERATION OF A PROPOSED PLENARY PRESENTATION WHICH WOULD DEAL WITH THE SECURITY OF SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS AND WITH STABILIZING MEASURES. ON SECURITY OF SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS, NORWAY DEP REP INDICATED THAT NORWAY HAD PROPOSED EARLIER IN THIS PRESENTATION THE WEST SHOULD STATE THAT THE FINAL AGREEMENT SHOULD CONTAIN NO PROVISIONS WHICH WOULD PRECLUDE POSSIBLE FUTURE EXTENSION OF REDUCTIONS TO ADDITIONAL AREAS. THE NORWAY REP SAID HE RECOGNIZED THAT THIS WAS IN CONFLICT WITH THE AGREED ALLIED POSITION AND HE HAD DISCOVERED

SECRET

NNN

SECRET POSS DUPE

PAGE 01 VIENNA 01418 03 OF 03 160633Z

12
ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 SS-20

USIA-15 SAM-01 NEA-11 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04

AEC-11 OMB-01 AECE-00 DRC-01 /166 W
----- 063717

P R 151856Z FEB 74
FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1648
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
INFO USMISSION NATO
AMEMBSSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 3 VIENNA 1418

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

STRONG RESISTANCE TO IT IN THE AHG DRAFTING GROUP WHICH HAD BEGUN WORK ON THE PRESENTATION. HE ADDED THAT ALTHOUGH HE HAD BEEN UNABLE TO CONTACT OSLO FOR SPECIFIC CHANGE OF INSTRUCTIONS PERMITTING HIM TO DROP THIS PROVISION, HE WAS NEARLY CERTAIN THAT SUCH INSTRUCTIONS WOULD BE FORTHCOMING AND THEREFORE

WOULD NOT PUSH INCLUSION OF THIS POINT. NORWEGIAN REP REITERATED, NEVERTHELESS, THAT PREFERENCE FOR EXTENDING THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS AT A LATER TIME REMAINED A PART OF NORWEGIAN POLICY.

14. THE ITALIAN REP THOUGHT THAT THE POINT SHOULD BE MADE IN THE PRESENTATION THAT ALTHOUGH EASTERN REPS HAVE REPEATEDLY STATED THAT THEIR PROPOSAL TAKES CARE OF THE CONCERNS OF THE FLANKS, THERE IS IN FACT NO MENTION OF THESE PROBLEMS IN THE EASTERN PROPOSAL. THE GROUP ALSO AGREED THAT ONE PROSPECTIVE ARGUMENT

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 01418 03 OF 03 160633Z

IN DRAFT PRESENTATION POINT OUT DISPARITIES FAVORING THE EAST IN AREAS OUTSIDE THE REDUCTIONS AREA BE HELD IN ABEYANCE PENDING INVESTIGATIONS TO MAKE SURE THAT DISPARITIES ALONG THE FLANKS WERE IN FACT TO NATO'S DISADVANTAGE.

15. CONSIDERABLE DEBATE TOOK PLACE OVER THE DEGREE OF SPECIFICITY WITH WHICH THE ALLIES SHOULD INDICATE IN THEIR PLENARY STATEMENT THAT WITHDRAWALS SHOULD BE ACCOMPANIED BY STEPS DESIGNED TO CREATE GREATER CONFIDENCE AMONG ALL PARTICIPANTS INCLUDING THE FLANKS. THE GREEK, TURKISH AND ITALIAN REPS STRONGLY OPPOSED AS TOO WEAK A PROPOSED FORMULATION TO THE EFFECT THAT WITHDRAWALS SHOULD BE "ACCOMPANIED BY ASSURANCES" WHICH WOULD PROMOTE GREATER CONFIDENCE AMONG ALL PARTICIPANTS, INCLUDING THE FLANKS. THE TURKISH REP (TUREL) AGREED THAT THE "ASSURANCES" WAS INSUFFICIENT. A MORE SPECIFIC COMMITMENT WAS REQUIRED.

16. THE ITALIAN REP SUGGESTED THAT THE QUESTION BE LEFT TO THE DRAFTING GROUP. GREEK REP THOUGHT THAT THIS WAS A BASIC POINT AND THAT THE DRAFTING GROUP DESERVED CLEAR GUIDANCE. THE FRG REP, WHO WAS TO GIVE THE PRESENTATION IN GERMAN, OPPOSED A SUGGESTION SUPPORTED BY FLANK PARTICIPANTS TO SUBSTITUTE "ACCOMPANIED BY MEANS TO PROVIDE" ON THE GROUNDS THAT IT WAS NOT TRANSLATABLE INTO GERMAN. FRG REP SUGGESTED "ACCOMPANIED BY PROVISIONS ASSURING" GREATER CONFIDENCE AMONG ALL PARTICIPANTS, ETC. THE GREEK, ITALIAN AND TURKISH REPS AGREED WITH THE FORMULATION AS DID BELGIUM, NETHERLANDS AND CANADA, RESULT WAS ITEM READING: BEGIN TEXT: THE WESTERN OUTLINE OF PROPOSALS CALLS FOR WITHDRAWAL TO THEIR HOMELANDS OF US AND SOVIET GROUND FORCES IN A FIRST PHASE. THIS REFLECTS OUR BELIEF THAT THOSE COUNTRIES SHOULD HELP TO ENSURE PEACE IN EUROPE. THOSE WITHDRAWALS SHOULD BE ACCOMPANIED BY PROVISIONS ASSURING GREATER CONFIDENCE AMONG ALL PARTICIPANTS INCLUDING THOSE WITH SPECIAL STATUS. END TEXT.

17. THE US DEP REP STATED THAT THE US THOUGHT THIS FORMU-

LATION QUESTIONABLE. SINCE THE "PROVISIONS" OF PARA 30 OF THE AGREED NATO PAPER WERE NOW BEING DISCUSSED IN THE SPC, THE AHG WOULD NOT WISH TO PREJUDGE THE OUTCOME OF

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 01418 03 OF 03 160633Z

THOSE DISCUSSIONS BY APPEARING TO REFER TO THOSE "PROVISIONS" IN ITS PRESENTATION. THEREFORE THE US MIGHT ACCEPT THIS FORMULATION ONLY ON THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE REFERENCE TO "PROVISIONS" WAS NOT REPEAT NOT TO BE CONSIDERED A REFERENCE TO THE PARA 30 MEASURES, BUT TO THE FOUR STABILIZING MEASURES THE ALLIES WOULD PRESENT ON THE NEXT PLENARY.

18. THE AHG THEN TURNED TO CONSIDERATION OF THE STABILIZING MEASURES PRESENTATION SCHEDULED TO BE DELIVERED BY THE FRG REP ON THE SAME OCCASION. A DISCUSSION TOOK PLACE ABOUT HOW THE STABILIZING MEASURES SHOULD BE DESCRIBED IN RELATION TO THE AGREEMENT. THE US REP EXPRESSED HIS OPPOSITION TO A PROPOSED DESCRIPTION OF SOME ELEMENTS IN SOVIET PROPOSAL AS ESSENTIAL TO REDUCTIONS AND THEREFORE NOT TRUE STABILIZING MEASURES. HE STATED THAT IT WAS IMPORTANT TO AVOID DWELLING ON THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THOSE PROVISIONS WHICH WERE NECESSARY PARTS OF ANY REDUCTION AGREEMENT, AND THOSE WHICH HAVE BEEN DESCRIBED AS ADDITIONAL, SEPARATE, CONTRIBUTIONS TO STABILITY. BOTH GREEK AND FRG REPS ARGUED, ON THE OTHER HAND, THAT ALLIES SHOULD NOT HESITATE TO TO DEFEND SUCH MEASURES AS LEGITIMATE AND JUSTIFIED IN THEIR OWN RIGHT. THE CANADIAN REP ALSO UNDERLINED THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS POINT. THE US REP REPLIED THAT HE ALSO AGREED THAT WEST SHOULD CONTINUE TO VIEW STABILIZING MEASURES AS VALUABLE IN AND FOR THEMSELVES. HOWEVER, THERE WAS TACTICAL PROBLEM TO BE CONSIDERED, WHICH WAS PROBABLY SOVIET CRITICISM OF MEASURES II, III AND IV IN PARA 23 OF THE ALLIED APPROACH PAPER, ON GROUNDS THAT THEY ARE PERIPHERAL TO REDUCTIONS. TO MINIMIZE COGENCY OF THIS ARGUMENT, THE US REP CONTINUED, IT WOULD BE ADVANTAGEOUS TO BE ABLE TO RELATE ALL FOUR MEASURES TO THE NECESSITY OF MAINTAINING FORCE LEVELS IN NGA WHEN REDUCTIONS TAKE PLACE. MEASURE I OF PARA 23 COULD BE DESCRIBED VERY LOGICALLY AS A MEANS FOR KEEPING ABREAST OF FORCE LEVELS IN THE NGA, AND WEST SHOULD BE IN POSITION TO DESCRIBE MEASURES II, III AND IV AS MEASURES TO REGULATE THE ACTIVITIES OF FORCES REMAINING WITHIN THE NGA. WHILE US DID NOT WISH TO BELITTLE THE LEGITIMACY OF STABILIZING MEASURES AS SUCH, IT WAS IMPORTANT NOT TO SUGGEST THAT MEASURES WHICH ARE ESSENTIAL TO THE AGREEMENT ARE NOT, FOR THAT REASON, LEGITIMATE STABILIZING

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 01418 03 OF 03 160633Z

MEASURES.

19. CANADIAN REP WONDERED IF IT WOULD NOT BE USEFUL TO REPEAT THE POINT WHICH HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN THE ALLIED NOV 15 PRESENTATION (GIVEN BY CANADIAN REP) IN WHICH THE ADVANTAGE OF STABILIZING MEASURES IN STRENGTHENING A HYPOTHETICAL DEFENDER AGAINST A HYPOTHETICAL AGGRESSOR HAD BEEN DESCRIBED. FRG DEP REP REPLIED THA DRAFTING COMMITTEE, IN ITS PRELIMINARY DE-LIBERATIONS ON FORTHCOMING PRESENTATION HAD DECIDED THAT NOV 15 PRESENTATION HAD OVER-EMPHASIZED THIS POINT. RECENT STUDIES INDICATED THAT ADVANTAGES OF STABILIZING MEASURES IN TERMS OF WARNING TIME WERE SMALLER THAN HAD PREVIOUSLY BEEN BELIEVED.

20. AFTER THIS DISCUSSION THE DRAFTING GROUP WAS ASKED TO PREPARE DRAFT PRESENTATION FOR LATER CONSIDERATION TAKING THESE POINTS OF VIEW INTO ACCOUNT.

21. THE MEETING THEN ADJOURNED WITH REPS AGREEING THAT NEXT MEETING SHOULD TAKE PLACE ON MONDAY, FEB 18, AT 3:30 P.M.HUMES

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, MEETINGS, MEETING DELEGATIONS, ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS, NEGOTIATIONS, MILITARY EXERCISES
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 15 FEB 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974VIENNA01418
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: n/a
From: VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740227/aaaaazls.tel
Line Count: 512
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 10
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 21 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <21 MAR 2002 by shawdg>; APPROVED <01 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: AD HOC GROUP MEETING, FEBRUARY 14, 1974
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005